

DISCLAIMER

This electronic version of an SCC order is for informational purposes only and is not an official document of the Commission. An official copy may be obtained from the [Clerk of the Commission, Document Control Center](#).

APPLICATION OF

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT COMPANY

CASE NO. PUE000407

**For approval of special rates pursuant to
Virginia Code § 56-235.2**

CERTIFICATION OF RULING TO THE COMMISSION

November 1, 2000

On July 28, 2000, Washington Gas Light Company ("Washington Gas") filed with the Commission an application pursuant to § 56-235.2 of the Code of Virginia for approval of special area development rates applicable to a defined area within its service territory in Loudoun County, Virginia. On August 24, 2000, the Commission issued an Order for Notice and Hearing which, among other things, established a procedural schedule for the filing of prefiled testimony and exhibits and scheduled a public hearing for November 8, 2000.

On October 30, 2000, Roanoke Gas Company ("Roanoke"), by counsel, filed a Motion to Late File Notice of Protest and Protest ("Motion") attached hereto. Roanoke requested that its Notice of Protest and Protest, which are attached to the Motion, be accepted for late filing. Pursuant to the Commission's Order for Notice and Hearing, Notices of Protest were due to be filed by September 22, 2000, and Protests were due to be filed by October 6, 2000. By its Motion, Roanoke further requested that it be allowed to file rebuttal to Staff testimony on November 1, 2000.

Also on October 30, 2000, Commission Staff, by counsel, filed a response to Roanoke's Motion, also attached hereto. Staff opposed the request, stating that such a late filing would be highly prejudicial to it. Staff further argued that if Roanoke desires to propose a surcharge for its customers similar to the proposed area development rate under consideration in the current proceeding, Roanoke may file its own application. Finally, Staff argued that Washington Gas has had ample time to solicit other gas utilities to appear as Protestants in support of the surcharge proposal.

By Ruling dated October 31, 2000, attached hereto, Roanoke's Motion was granted in part. The late-filed Notice of Protest and Protest were accepted for filing, and Roanoke was allowed to participate in the November 8, 2000, hearing through cross-examination of witnesses and to file a post-hearing brief. Roanoke's request to file rebuttal testimony to Staff testimony was denied. As a Protestant, Roanoke may only file direct testimony. The deadline for filing direct testimony has passed; to permit Roanoke to prefile direct testimony at this time would be prejudicial to the Staff and other parties.

In response to the Hearing Examiner's Ruling, Roanoke filed a Motion for Immediate Certification of Hearing Examiner's Ruling to the State Corporation Commission, also attached hereto. Roanoke requests that it be allowed to prefile the testimony of John B. Williamson, chairman and chief executive officer of Roanoke, on November 1, 2000, or as soon as possible

thereafter, and that Mr. Williamson be allowed to appear at the November 8, 2000, hearing and present that testimony. Roanoke argues, among other things, that a precedent may be set against the adoption of the area development rate and that such a decision effectively will foreclose the filing of an area development rate by Roanoke.

I hereby certify the pending Motion to the Commission for determination.

Alexander F. Skirpan, Jr.
Hearing Examiner